

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 7, 2005 ("Office Action"), has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-12 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over the previously cited Piazza and McGuire. Claim 13 stands rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over the previously cited Piazza, McGuire and Bak. Applicants incorporate herein by reference and reiterate the arguments presented in previous papers. In addition, Applicants provide the following clarifications. As stated previously, Piazza does not disclose that his system is applicable to C/C++ program language. To repair the admitted deficiencies of Piazza, the Examiner relies on the following statement in McGuire:

the system and method for variables representing Quantities is implemented in an object oriented language from Curl Corporation. The language allows the creation of objects and has similar capabilities to those found in languages such as Scheme, Lisp and C++." Col. 8, lines 32-27.

The Examiner relies on this statement to allegedly disclose that C++ and Scheme are interchangeable languages. See Office Action, p. 3. Applicants, again, respectfully submit that this is an improper reading of McGuire. To see that this is so, consider the following example.

McGuire's statement is (emphasis added): "[t]he language ... has similar capabilities to those found in languages such as Scheme, Lisp and C++." Replacing the underlined parts, we can make an equivalent statement: "French has similar capabilities to those found in languages such as Portuguese, Italian and Spanish." Clearly, one cannot rely on this statement to say that Portuguese and Spanish are equivalent any more than one can rely on McGuire to say that Scheme and C++ are equivalent.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the previously submitted "Appendix B" supports the position that C++ and Scheme are not interchangeable. The Examiner rebuts the evidence in Appendix B by stating that the evidence only shows that "C" and Scheme are not equivalent. See Office Action, p. 3. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's position is incorrect because it ignores other statements in Appendix B. Specifically, the first paragraph of Appendix B states (emphasis added):

The reason for this page is that this course uses scheme, whereas many students in the class taking the course (most of whom are freshmen) have only programmed in C (and/or related languages like C++ or java) before. This is an issue because scheme and C each encourage a very different style of programming

Thus, the emphasized parenthetical portion indicates that the author of Appendix B equates C and C++ and the associated difficulties in going from programming in those languages to programming in Scheme. Others of ordinary skill in the art also frequently equate C and C++ as evidenced by the widespread use of the shorthand notation "C/C++" to stand for either language. See, e.g., www.cuj.com, homepage of "C/C++ Users Journal." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Appendix B does provide evidence that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to interchange Scheme and C++.

Finally, Applicants again submit that the rejections are improper because the proposed combination of Piazza and McGuire also fails to disclose or suggest a compiler for C/C++ programs. In fact, McGuire does not even use C/C++ in his claimed invention. McGuire uses the Curl Corporation language, not C/C++. Thus, the proposed combination of Piazza and McGuire fails to disclose or

suggest at least "a first C/C++ program" as claimed by Applicants. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is rejected by Piazza, McGuire and Bak. However, Bak is relied upon to allegedly disclose "a data signal embodied as a carrier wave" and, thus, does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the proposed combination of Piazza and McGuire. For at least this reason Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

I. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

Patent Application
Attorney Docket No.: 57983.00046
Client Reference No.: 13825RNUS01U

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Christopher Cuneo
Registration No. 42,450
for
Thomas E. Anderson
Registration No. 37,063

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: June 24, 2005